

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/639,468	08/13/2003	Franz-Xaver Bernhard	BERNHARD3	6109
1444	7590 09/24/2004		EXAMINER	
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.			WILSON, LEE D	
624 NINTH S' SUITE 300	IREEI, NW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTO	ON, DC 20001-5303		3723	

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/639,468	BERNHARD ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	LEE D WILSON	3723				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above, is less than thirty (30) days, and if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a i. a reply within the statutory minimum of thir ariod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tatute, cause the application to become Al	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication 3ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	n.			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _	·					
	This action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction are	drawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co			d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a 	nents have been received. nents have been received in A priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview S	Summary (PTO-413)				
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/13/03</u>. 		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/639,468 Page 2

Art Unit: 3723

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the term "means" appears in the body of the text. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
 - a. The following claims lack proper antecedent basis.
 - i. "In claim 1, line 14, and claim 4, line 14, "it". This limitation should be positively recited.
 - ii. In claim 7, lines 5&6, "its" and "it". This limitation should be positively recited.
 - b. The following claims are vague, indefinite, awkwardly, and/or confunsingly worded.

Application/Control Number: 10/639,468

Art Unit: 3723

iii. In claim 1, line 8, "such". This is idiomatic English and awkward as well.

Page 3

- iv. In claim 1, line 17, "same". The limitation should positively be recited so it is clear what element is be referred to.
- v. In claim 2, line 2. "preferably". This limitation is either being claimed or not.
- vi. In claim 4, line 15 and claim 10, line 4, "more particularly". This awkwardly worded and limitations should be claimed without such narrative language.
- vii. In claims 8, line 16 and claim 10, line 5, "and/or". Limitations cannot be claimed in both the alternative and inclusively. This is confusing.
- 4. Regarding claims 7 and 9, the phrase "or the like and/or bell-like" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "or the like"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Allowable Subject Matter

- 5. ClaimS 1-10 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.
- 6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Read over Us 2004/01133346a1 and 2003/0071407a1 because the application recites a clamp element moving through a central guide region having an annular groove to receive a sealing ring which recite more and different structure than the steel

Application/Control Number: 10/639,468 Page 4

Art Unit: 3723

ball of the prior which would not require a sealing ring nor annular groove because the structure would not require it.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Zika et al, Kaakami et al, and Yonezawa disclose a device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEE D WILSON whose telephone number is 703-305-4094. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOSEPH HAIL can be reached on 703-308-2687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ldw

September 16, 2004

LEED. WILSON

LEE D. WILSON PRIMARY EXAMINER